

Summary

Project: Heber Valley Corridor EIS

Subject: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #3

Date: Thursday, October 28, 2021

Location: Heber City Police Department / Zoom

Stakeholder Working Group

Name	Representing	Role
Craig Hancock	UDOT	Project Manager
Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager
Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager
Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager
Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead
Charles Allen	HVC Team	Traffic Lead
Justin Smart	HVC Team	Public Involvement Lead
Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement
Tony Kohler	Heber City	Planning Director
Dustin Grabau	Wasatch Co.	County Assistant Manager
Ryan Taylor	Daniel	Town Engineer
Justin Keys	Open Space	Wasatch County Open Lands Board
David Booth	Emergency Services	Heber Police Chief
Paul Sweat	School District	Superintendent
Shawn Seager	Rural Planning Organization	MAG Planning Director
Don Taylor	Non-motorized Transportation	MAG Trail Planner
Terry Smith	Trucking	UT Trucking Assoc. Safety Director
Addison Hicken	Agricultural	Farming
Brady Flygare	Residential	South resident
Thom Wright	Residential	East resident
Wendy Casey	Residential	West resident
Phillip Jordan	Residential	North resident
Laren Gertsch	Landowner	Landowner
David Nelson	Development	Millstream Group
Dallin Koechner	Business	Heber Valley Chamber Executive Director
Tom Stone	Business	CAMS Chairman
Jeffery Bradshaw	Housing	Wasatch County Housing Authority

Meeting Topics:

1. The objective of this fourth stakeholder working group (SWG) meeting was to provide an update on the revised purpose and need, an overview of conceptual alternatives and public comments received to date, and discuss feedback heard from constituents thus far.

2. Revised purpose and need statement:

The purpose of the Heber Valley Corridor EIS is to improve regional and local mobility on U.S. 40 from S.R. 32 to U.S. 189 and provide opportunities for non-motorized transportation while allowing Heber City to meet their vision for the historic town center.

3. Conceptual alternatives overview:

- a. There has been talk of a west bypass for many years, why do we need to look at other alternatives now? NEPA requires us to look at all reasonable alternatives. Thirteen conceptual alternatives were presented to the public that will be evaluated, along with the No-action alternative.
- b. One member asked if the alternatives could be combined.
 - i. The intent is for each alternative to be stand alone. If the alternative meets the project purpose, additional impacts from adding other alternatives are not warranted.
- c. One member asked how we can get trucks from the east to go around to use a west bypass. Another member asked with all the development on the west side, how will we encourage people to take an east bypass?
 - i. The purpose is to improve mobility on U.S. 40. The issue is not just trucks, it is the total traffic volume. Removing truck traffic is not part of the purpose and need. Additionally, as conditions on U.S. 40 improve, it improves overall mobility in the valley, whether for those traveling the local system or traveling on a new east or western facility.
- d. One member asked if there are alternatives that will get eliminated based on impacts to historic buildings.
 - i. Part of the purpose is to allow Heber City to meet their vision for the historic town center. If an alternative is so destructive that Heber City could not meet their vision, that alternative would not meet the project purpose and would be eliminated.
 - ii. Historic buildings are also considered in Level 2 screening because they are protected by Section 4(f).
- e. One frequently heard comment from constituents is that it would be better to tie a bypass into U.S. 40 farther to the north at River Road.
 - i. This would accommodate planned growth on the north side of town. One member commented the purpose of the project is to improve mobility in the Heber Valley, not just in Heber City.

(1) The travel demand model considers planned growth in the entire valley.
 - ii. Concerns were raised regarding the location of the intersection with U.S. 40. With Smiths Marketplace going in at ~750 North, can we create a safe intersection without reducing speed?

- f. Constituents are concerned about how the local road network would be impacted by bypass alternatives. Will residents be isolated? Or will connectivity be maintained? Will roads go over or under? Will it be difficult to cross with heavy traffic?
- g. Members reported that some of their constituents don't see how any alternative that improves U.S. 40 would allow Heber City to meet their vision for the historic town center. The vision is for a walkable downtown, and improvements on U.S. 40 make it less desirable to walk there.
 - i. There is an underground stream running under Main Street. The plan is to daylight it in the downtown area. A tunnel may interfere with this.

4. Discussion

- a. What is the role/responsibility of Heber City and Wasatch County is in this process? One member commented that it seems like the City and County are not actively doing much to improve traffic and are waiting for UDOT to fix things.
 - i. The Wasatch Regional planning Organization (RPO) is responsible to update the Rural Transportation Plan (RTP) every 4 years, which includes UDOT projects and local projects. The City and County transportation plans should reflect updates in the RTP. UDOT assumes projects in the RTP will be executed in the travel demand analysis. If they are not executed, congestion can be expected sooner.
 - ii. Improvements to state routes (U.S. 40 is a state route) are not within City or County jurisdiction. UDOT needs to lead the process.
 - iii. UDOT can't determine what the City and County do. There needs to be collaboration between UDOT and local government. Whatever comes out of the EIS, it is not likely to be paid for solely by UDOT.
- b. Who is responsible for the screening process?
 - i. UDOT is responsible for conducting screening and is asking for public input on the screening criteria.
- c. One member asked where impacts to homes and neighborhoods are included in the screening process.
 - i. The screening process looks first at whether the alternative meets the purpose and need (level 1 screening), then at impacts to key resources (level 2 screening). The resources evaluated in level 2 screening include wetlands and other Waters of the U.S., and Section 4(f) resources (public parks and recreation areas, historic properties). These resources are evaluated during screening because they have strong protection under the law. UDOT cannot select an alternative that impacts these resources if there is an alternative that meets the purpose and does not impact them.
 - ii. Level 2 screening also includes property impacts and cost.
 - iii. It is not efficient to conduct detailed analysis of alternatives that cannot be selected. A detailed analysis will be conducted on all alternatives that make it through the screening

- process. The detailed analysis will include social and community impacts, noise, visual, etc., and will be considered in selection of the preferred alternative.
- iv. One member commented that Heber City is looking at an open space and sensitive lands ordinance and requested that it be considered in screening.
 - d. Can trucks be restricted on Main Street? What if Heber City takes over jurisdiction?
 - i. The analysis done for the EIS cannot assume Heber City takes over jurisdiction.
 - ii. The goal is to improve local and regional mobility on U.S. 40, not to remove truck traffic.
 - e. Who is responsible for the east bypass and when will it be done?
 - i. Red Ledges and Heber City are in the process of constructing an east bypass in the northeast quadrant (north of Center Street and east of U.S. 40). Construction will be done in spring of 2023.
 - (1) Millstream (developer) is responsible for the segment between U.S. 40 and the cemetery.
 - (2) Heber City has a grant for the section through the cemetery.
 - (3) Red Ledges (developer) is responsible for the portion east of Mill Road and north of Center Street.
 - ii. The east conceptual alternatives (EA, EB, and EC) under consideration for the EIS would use this alignment as much as possible but would require modifications (wider cross section, larger curves to accommodate higher design speed).
 - f. One member noted there is a lot of misinformation circulating in the community, especially on social media.
 - g. One member commented that the airport is a hot topic right now. Even if rerouting U.S. 189 is not intended to help airport expansion, it would open the doors.
 - h. One member asked what would happen if Heber City does not want the preferred alternative from the EIS?
 - i. The EIS process is to solve a problem, it is not politically driven. However, it would be challenging if there was not collaboration between UDOT and the local governments. UDOT wants to encourage a collaborative process.
 - i. Next Steps:
 - i. Submit comments and encourage others to submit comments during official comment period (by November 4).
 - ii. The project team will review all comments and determine if any alternatives should be modified or if additional alternatives should be added prior to screening. Through the screening process, the project team will narrow down the reasonable range of alternatives to a handful that will be evaluated in detail.

- iii. The results of the screening process will be published for public and agency review and comment, anticipated in early 2022.